Originality, Spontaneity, and Sincerity: The Rise of the Sketch in France at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century

AUTHOR(S):

Myers, Nicole R.

CITATION:

Myers, Nicole R.. Originality, Spontaneity, and Sincerity: The Rise of the Sketch in France at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century. Kyoto Studies in Art History 2017, 2: 99-110

ISSUE DATE:

2017-04

URL:

https://doi.org/10.14989/229463

Originality, Spontaneity, and Sincerity: The Rise of the Sketch in France at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century

Nicole R. Myers

Much of art production and its criticism in France throughout the course of the nineteenth century was marked by a heated aesthetic debate. Triggered by the emergence of the Romantic school in the 1820s, the sketch-finish conflict, as it came to be called, centered on the Academy of Fine Art's firm separation of the preparatory phases of painting—the making of sketches or *esquisses*—from the painstakingly finished work. Feeling that the Neoclassical emphasis on polished surfaces stifled pictorial expression, the Romantics incorporated the looser facture and striking tonal contrasts of the painted preparatory sketch into their final works in order to express their personal visions. This breach of Academic standards was perceived by most artists, critics, and conservatives as a frightening collapse of traditional values, while liberals celebrated the return of originality and passion to the art of the waning French school. Artist's journal entries, Salon reviews, and speeches given at the Academy reveal a veritable preoccupation with the merits and limitations of the sketch, the debate sharpening under the July Monarchy and its democratic stance towards diverse artistic styles. Not coincidentally, the development of an aesthetic of the sketch during this period coincided with the rise in status of the landscape genre, and, in particular, the emergence of a new school of independent landscape painters. It was in the works of artists such as Camille Corot, Paul Huet, Théodore Rousseau, and Virgile Diaz de la Peña that the sketch-finish conflict reached its height and was ultimately resolved. This paper will examine the aesthetic of the sketch, mapping its emergence and eventual acceptance through institutional, political, social, and commercial changes.

Before moving forward with this discussion, it is important to establish what the term *esquisse* indicated to its nineteenth-century French audience. Art criticism of this period is riddled with a variety of words, such as *croquis*, *esquisse*, and *ébauche*, that are commonly translated today as the singular and general term sketch in English. However, this terminology signified quite precise meanings in relation to the various preparatory stages of producing a finished painting under the Academic guidelines established by the École des Beaux-Arts.[1] *Croquis* were rapidly drawn thumbnail sketches made in pencil, pen, or brush that record the artist's *première pensée* of a given subject and dashed off with sparse marks or lines. Unlike the *croquis*, which strove to capture the basic contours of the principal forms, the painted *esquisse* was a small-scale, quickly executed sketch whose primary function was to block in a picture's composition and coloring. As the focus of the *esquisse* was the overall ensemble, details were omitted in favor of a more general treatment of forms constructed with large and fluid brush strokes. Spontaneity, imagination, and rapid execution were its hallmarks, as the *esquisse* was intended to preserve the artist's initial conception of a subject. Colors were generally unmixed and the middle tones found in more finished works were eschewed. Rather, dark tones were applied in relatively thin glazes while the highlights—often pure white pigment—were typically painted in a heavy impasto. The result is a generally high-keyed, luminous tonality with striking contrasts in value (see, for example, fig. 1).

Fig. 1 Théodore Géricault, *The Oath of Brutus after the Death of Lucretia*, ca. 1815–1816, oil on canvas, 15 3/16 x 18 5/16 inches (38.6 x 46.5 cm), The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri. Purchase: William Rockhill Nelson Trust, 92-35.

While an *esquisse* was essentially a rough draft that served as a guideline for the creation of a larger, more finished painting, an *ébauche* was the underpainting that formed the basis of the final work. Often less finished than the *esquisse* in its treatment, the *ébauche* laid in the composition of a painting with a thin wash of reddish-brown oil paint called sauce that was rubbed into the prepared canvas in a crude and often vague manner. As with the *esquisse*, the artist concentrated on establishing rough areas of light and dark masses, typically in earth tones, adding the local colors last in an attempt to achieve the spontaneous effect of the sketch. Unlike the latter, however, the *ébauche* was thin in surface texture and eventually covered through the finishing process, thus remaining undetectable in the final picture. These preliminary steps were employed by both academically and independently trained artists, who would typically prepare for a finished painting by first making a *croquis*, then a painted *esquisse*, which would inform the final step of making an *ébauche*.

Originating in sixteenth-century Venice, the making of preparatory *esquisses* had become a widespread practice throughout Europe by the seventeenth century. Its introduction in France in this period was due largely to the Italian training of artists like Charles Le Brun, the eventual director of the Academy who did much to establish its quintessential values and practices. By the eighteenth century, the freedom of touch generally associated with the sketch could be found in finished paintings, such as the immensely popular *têtes de fantaisies* by Fragonard.[2] It was during this period that the inherent qualities of the sketch, namely the lively effect produced by its energetic brushwork, vibrant colors, and bold contrasts, began to be admired in their own right. Art writers and philosophers like Denis Diderot theorized the aesthetic of the sketch, whose originality, spontaneity, and sincerity was seen as the antithesis to the refined and highly

finished pictures exhibited by the Academy.[3] In his review of the 1767 Salon, Diderot asked, "Why does a beautiful sketch please us more than a beautiful painting?" The answer, he explained, is "because there is more life and fewer formal details. Proportionately, the more details are introduced, the more life disappears."[4] Diderot identified this lively effect with the rapid, abbreviated manner in which the sketch is produced. He continued,

> Why does a young student who is incapable of making a mediocre painting make a marvelous sketch? It is because the sketch is a work of fire and genius and the painting is the work of labor and patience, of long studies and a consummate experience of art.[5]

With this seemingly simple statement, Diderot outlined the essential dichotomy established and maintained by the Academy between the sketch and the finished painting. The sketch represented the artist's deeply personal and emotional reaction to the subject and as such was a sign of his genius and originality. But it was only through the methodical and reflective reworking of the initial impression into a finished work that an artist could show his discipline, intellect, and mastery of painting techniques. This philosophical division of artistic processes would be perfected in the last quarter of the eighteenth century by Jacques-Louis David's Neoclassical doctrine, which became the dogma of the École des Beaux-Arts.[6] While David advocated freedom of handling in the sketch technique he taught his students, their finished paintings were expected to have invisible brushwork, tightly rendered forms, and attention to detail.[7] The Academy intended these two elements to balance each other—passion moderated through reason—however critics frequently remarked that the clear-cut separation between the sketch and finished work often worked to the disadvantage of both phases of production.[8] Diderot noted this mutual exclusivity, concluding his line of questioning with a challenge of sorts by asking whether there was anyone out there who could strike a balance between the two. Though writing in the mid-eighteenth century, Diderot foreshadowed the sketch-finish conflict that would dominate art production and its criticism in the nineteenth century.

By the end of seventeenth century, the practice of submitting painted sketches as embryonic plans for future works in competitions for official commissions or acceptance into the Academy was well established in France.[9] However, a newfound importance was given to the production of sketches during the Bourbon Restoration (1814–1830), which reinstated the Academy of Fine Arts in 1815 after its dissolution during the French Revolution.[10] One of the first tasks that the Academy undertook was to establish a new division of the prestigious Prix de Rome competition, adding the category of historical landscape painting to the preexisting contest for historical compositions in 1816.[11] The production of painted sketches played a crucial role in both categories of the Prix de Rome. They were submitted in preliminary trials to enter the contest, and then again in the various phases of the competition itself.[12] As preparing students for the Prix de Rome was the ultimate focus of Academic training until the contest was cancelled in 1863, the École des Beaux-Arts followed suit by augmenting its curriculum. In 1816, it established a twice-yearly *concours de composition* for history painting whose two preliminary phases and final round each necessitated the creation of a sketch on a historical subject.[13] A painted sketch competition for historical landscapes followed shortly after in 1821.[14]

The primary aesthetic qualities used to judge the sketches in these competitions were coloring and overall effect achieved by the distribution of light and dark values across the surface of the support. However, what was really being evaluated was the creativity of the artist with regard to constructing a composition. The finishing phase of making a painting

was considered to be mechanical, the product of hard labor and self-discipline. It was in the spontaneous process of making a sketch that an artist's originality was thought to be expressed. A composition that was formally inventive yet also harmonious was crucial to the sketch's success and, consequently, to that of the final painting it would inspire.[15]

The underlying concept behind these competitions was that artistic genius could be adequately judged in an artist's sketch, but not everyone was happy with the predominance given to this practice. For example, Eugène-Emmanuel Amaury-Duval, a student of Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, described the difficulties inherent in the sketch competition to a friend: "Imagine now a young man of an already remarkable talent, but a little slow to invent, only being able to render his clear-cut idea with adequate time. Success is assured for those with facile talent and sleight of the hand."[16] Amaury-Duval's anxiety over the likely triumph of a lesser artist with a natural ability to produce rapid sketches over that of a genuinely talented artist who needed more time for reflection would be loudly echoed by artists and critics in the opening years of the July Monarchy (1830–1848).

In September of 1830, Louis-Philippe's arts administration announced the creation of a series of competitions for government commissions that were open to Academic and independent artists alike in an attempt to show the new government's democratic position and liberal acceptance of a wide array of artistic styles.[17] While these contests signaled a political form of art patronage, Louis-Philippe was ultimately aiming to please his growing bourgeois constituency and, in turn, help cultivate their artistic taste. Almost immediately into his reign, he made the Salon an annual event in order to allow more frequent public access to paintings. Public opinion took on a new importance both with regard to official policies and artistic trends, where it exerted an unprecedented and considerable influence. Although the open competitions were intended to garner public support for Louis-Philippe, they consequently pushed the sketch-finish polemic out of Academic circles and into the public sphere.[18]

Like the Prix de Rome, these competitions for government commissions involved the making of presentation sketches that were exhibited for public review and from which a winner would be selected. Though this followed the long-established tradition, partisans of the Academy fought bitterly against the use of the sketch as the final means for artistic judgment. In 1830, the Academician Raoul-Rochette echoed Amaury-Duval's complaint:

> The mediocre artist excels at making sketches, precisely because this is all he can do. In this kind of work, where indecision is unavoidable, facility is a merit and even inaccuracy has charm, it is only too easy to […] to pretend to a talent one does not possess […]. Thus in a contest based on the finished sketch, all the advantages are on the side of mediocrity and all the challenges are against genuine talent.[19]

Though this antagonistic position might seem surprising coming from a member of the Academy, which structured its own competitions on the evaluation of sketches, it must be remembered that the final round of the Prix de Rome was the creation of a finished work of art. Detractors like Raoul-Rochette claimed that submitting a presentation sketch for ultimate judgment was detrimental to artists, whose precursory work did not convey their full range of talent.[20] Those in favor of the use of the presentation sketch countered by arguing that the sketch was a work of the mind, not of the hand, and that true genius would always reveal itself through invention.[21] But what was ultimately at stake here was the official treatment of the sketch as a work in its own right and the ensuing implication that the skills exhibited in the sketch were all that was necessary for the creation of a

successful painting. The development of an appreciation of the sketch aesthetic troubled those who feared that it would enable artists to present their *esquisses* as important works of art, thus inverting the Academy's emphasis on methodical finish over instinctual creation.[22]

Adding fuel to the fire was the growing popularity of Romanticism, a non-Academic trend that developed in opposition to the Neoclassical style. Essential to David's doctrine was the conviction that artists had an ethical responsibility to present finished works —the result of honest labor—to the public as they alone could express moral content and thus possess social value. Sketches were viewed as deeply personal and private works, and just as one would not expose oneself in public, it was the artist's professional duty to only present polished works.[23] But Romantic landscape and history painters, like Théodore Géricault, favored spontaneity and sincerity of emotion, and they deliberately adopted a looser execution to achieve pictorial expressiveness. In retaining aspects of the sketch in their finished paintings, the Romantics made a claim to artistic originality through facture and color. For the Academy and its strict separation of the preparatory and final phases of artistic production, the informal aspects of Romantic paintings could only be associated with the *esquisse*, *ébauche*, or *étude*, and was thus unworthy of public exhibition. Academicians and their partisans denounced the sketch aesthetic as proof that an artist lacked the skill, self-discipline, or moral fiber necessary to complete a finished picture.[24]

Not coincidentally, the growing popularity of the sketch aesthetic was crystallized under the July Monarchy through the government's association with Romanticism.[25] Louis-Philippe's national sketch contest invited the participation of non-Academic painters, such as Eugène Delacroix and Octave Tassaert, who challenged the authority of the École's teachings and the Academy's monopoly on artistic style and taste. What started as a political tool to win over the bourgeoisie was soon associated with official support of radical artistic tendencies, and the Academy felt its time-honored traditions were under attack. Louis-Philippe's competitions were ultimately short lived with only three contests taking place between 1830 and 1831 before cancellation due to protests by both independent and Academic painters.[26] But what emerged was a reformulation of the sketch-finish conflict, which began by questioning whether sketches should be used to judge artistic talent and ended as an impassioned debate over the validity of the aesthetic itself.[27]

The debate was played out emphatically in art criticism, whose only framework for discussing the variety of new artistic trends appearing in the annual Salons was in terms of the sketch-finish dichotomy. In the battle for the cultivation of bourgeois taste, critics strove in their Salon reviews to educate the public on either the pros or the cons of the sketch depending on their point of view. In the 1820s, the conservative critic Etienne-Jean Delécluze relentlessly attacked the emergence of the sketch aesthetic in the works exhibited by Delacroix. A former student in David's studio, Delécluze basically reincarnated the eighteenth-century debate of color vs. line into that of the sketch vs. finish.[28] Though he ardently admired Delacroix's gift for coloring, energetic forms, and inventive compositions, Delécluze could not accept that Delacroix gave priority to these qualities at the expense of accurate drawing and appropriate finish. Speaking of Delacroix's first Salon contribution, *The Barque of Dante* (1822, Musée du Louvre, Paris), which was easily the star of the exhibition and was purchased by the state, Delécluze concluded that it was nothing more than "a sketch composed and painted with verve."[29] Delécluze was even more caustic with regard to Delacroix's exhibition of the *Massacre of Chios* (Musée du Louvre, Paris) at the Salon of 1824, pointing out to his readers its hasty facture and inexcusably poor drawing.[30]

Delacroix did not start out deliberately seeking the effects of the sketch, however. His journal entries from this time reveal that he agonized over his weakness with regard to contour due to his preference for building mass through rough patches of color instead of line. It was not until the 1840s that he realized the energetic effect he sought in his painting emanated from the incorporation of free and visible brushstrokes into the final work.[31]

While the tension between Delécluze and Delacroix is most often cited as expressing the epitome of the sketch-finish conflict in the nineteenth-century, it was in the genre of landscape painting that the debate was most heated and, in the end, resolved. In his enormously influential treatise of 1800 titled *Elements of Practical Perspective*, Pierre-Henri de Valenciennes aimed to revive the classical seventeenth-century French landscape tradition of Nicolas Poussin and Claude Lorrain. In an attempt to elevate its status to the same level as history painting, Valenciennes identified two categories of landscape: the rural and the historic. Though both types aimed at the expression of beauty, they did so through different means. The rural landscape presented humble scenes of nature in its raw state and was dependent on the artist's emotional reaction to the subject in order to transform the ordinary into something beautiful. As this vision of nature was grounded in a truthful representation, Valenciennes advocated the use of vibrant tones and an attention to pictorial effects of atmosphere in order to move the viewer and convey a sense of the picturesque. The historical landscape, which Valenciennes preferred, was a representation of nature in its ideal state and as such it relied upon the artist's intellect to carefully construct various elements into a harmonious whole. A graceful recession into space, typically conveyed by a meandering stream or path, as well as a mountainous horizon, bits of ancient architecture, and an unobtrusive human presence became systematic elements in the expression of the grandeur of nature.[32]

At the heart of both these landscape endeavors was the importance of studying nature directly through the practice of making *plein-air études* or outdoor studies, which Valenciennes advocated should be "sketches made in haste, seizing nature in its actuality."[33] Although the *étude* was similar to the compositional *esquisse* in its concentration on creating a harmonious ensemble, its primary purpose was to establish the principal tones of the sky, earth, and water through the lighting of the landscape at that particular moment. Per Valenciennes, finish and detail were to be abandoned in favor of a rapid execution that should take no more than two hours to produce and, if the study was of a sunset or sunrise, a maximum of only thirty minutes.[34]

The painted landscape *étude* was considered an objective, quasi-scientific process of the direct recording of natural effects and thus was not considered to be an imaginative work that revealed the artist's genius. Rather, as formulated by Valenciennes, these latter qualities were expressed in the creation of the final work in the studio. This was especially true for historical landscape painting in which the *beau idéal* was created through the careful and inventive synthesis of various *études*. In defining the historical landscape as a conceptual practice, Valenciennes elevated it to the same status occupied by history painting and undoubtedly paved the way to the Academy's approval of the genre and the creation of the Prix de Rome for landscape. His treatise also contributed to the rise in status of the rural landscape genre and the subsequent growth of independent landscape painters in the 1820s and 1830s.[35]

Virtually all of the art critics writing Salon reviews during this period marveled over the newfound dominance of landscape painting, which was leading the way in defining a modern French school. And it was in the work of several independent artists who made their debut in the Salons of 1830 and 1831 that the historical mode of landscape painting

was publically challenged. Opposing the superficial idealization of the historical landscape, this new group of painters, who were referred to alternately as naturalists or realists, took their subjective experiences before nature as the starting point for their landscapes.[36] Desiring sincerity of both emotion and vision, artists like Corot, Huet, Rousseau, and Diaz de la Peña aimed for the immediacy, freshness, and optical truth embodied in the *plein-air étude*. As the overall pictorial effect of light and atmosphere assumed greater importance, the facture of the independents' landscapes subsequently became less defined. Varied and looser brushstrokes functioned to unify the composition across the entire canvas, foregoing specific details to achieve a harmonious effect. It was in this process, in the truthful recording of one's personal impression of natural effects, that the independent landscape painters conveyed their originality.[37]

Although Corot began exhibiting his works in 1827, it was only in 1830 that he stood out for bridging the gap between the declining Neoclassical tradition and the rise of the naturalist school. Despite being classically trained, Corot considered the loose facture of the sketch the necessary means to achieve the poetic atmospheric effect he was seeking in his finished work, a style that reached its full maturity in the 1840s. It was his sensitive balance of feathery brushstrokes with a carefully constructed and imaginative composition that landed him in good favor with both liberals and conservatives (see, for example, fig. 2). For critics like Théophile Thoré, the goal of art was not a photographic imitation of nature, as exhibited in the *plein-air étude*, but rather poetry created through rhythm, tone, and color.[38] Corot's success reveals that the acceptance of the sketch aesthetic in a finished work of art hinged in large part on the artist's ability to create a poetic landscape that stirred the viewer's soul, thus making it complete.

But the line that separated a poetic landscape from one that was considered an *esquisse*, *étude*, or *ébauche* was a fine one. Diaz represented a kind of paradox for most critics, who referred to his finished paintings as sketches or studies and yet could not help but admit that they found them delightful in spite of it. Even Delécluze, perhaps the most

Fig. 2 Camille Corot, *The Bath of Diana*, ca. 1855, oil on canvas, Dallas Museum of Art, Foundation for the Arts Collection, Mrs. John B. O'Hara Fund, 2005.15.FA.

Fig. 3 Narcisse Virgile Diaz de la Peña, *Common with Stormy Sunset*, 1850, oil on wood panel, 37.1 x 54.6 cm, National Gallery of Art, London, Salting Bequest, 1910.

outspoken opponent of the sketch aesthetic, admired Diaz's *Common with Stormy Sunset*, calling it a "charming painted *esquisse*," despite its "vague execution" (fig. 3).[39]

Rousseau did not fair as well, however, and the reason is not immediately evident. Of all the independent landscapists submitting works to the Salon in the first half of the nineteenth century, Rousseau was easily the most tormented by the sketch-finish conflict. Between 1836 and 1842, his paintings were systematically rejected from the Salon, earning him the nickname "*le grand refusé*."[40] Rousseau's cause was taken up by a number of supporters who decried his unjust treatment by Salon jurors. It was not until 1849, when the jury was elected by their peers, that Rousseau marked a triumphant return to the Salon with the exhibition of several landscapes that earned him a gold medal. The place of honor given to his works at the following year's Salon provoked Delécluze to rant:

> With regard to his system, that of only making sloppy *ébauches* instead of *tableaux*, I will repeat what I have already said, that the great masters of all the schools made finished paintings for the public, and that their *esquisses*, their *ébauches*, drawn or painted, were only known and sought after when these men had arrived at the apogee of their talent, and even more after their death.[41]

Delécluze noted that the rise of the sketch aesthetic, what he saw as the desire to "reproduce the *vulgar*, the *ugly* […] in favor of the most incorrect and ugly execution," was due primarily to the incapacity of the younger generation of artists to do anything more than a sketch. But as hinted at above, he also described a secondary cause, that of the influence of money-driven *amateurs de tableaux* over the past several years. He blamed the large number of "*pochades*" that graced the Salon walls and picture dealers' windows on collectors' taste for Old Master paintings. As the modern painters imitated the virtuosic brushwork of Tintoretto, Caravaggio, and Zurbaran, Delécluze concluded that the extensive presence and advantageous placement of rustic landscapes in the 1850 Salon would undoubtedly raise their value, and thus were made with these *amateurs* in mind.[42] Though

of course this is an exaggeration, Delécluze was ultimately not that far off. Despite being rejected from the Salon year after year, Rousseau was able to cultivate a prestigious private clientele, selling his oil studies to members of the ruling elite as early as 1835.[43] After his first Salon rejection in 1836, Rousseau began experimenting with painting techniques, eventually settling on the aesthetic of the *ébauche*, which was the less finished, earth-toned underpainting that would be worked up into a finished picture in the studio. Instead of covering the *ébauche* with successive layers of finishing touches to render a "complete" painting, Rousseau would leave varying degrees of the *ébauche* visible depending on the effect he was seeking.[44]

As Delécluze so bitterly observed, these "unfinished" paintings found favor with connoisseurs who preferred the visible presence of the artist's hand on the canvas over the glossy finish of Academic paintings.[45] Rousseau catered to this taste by producing modest landscape *ébauches* that were based on *plein-air études* directly for the art market, which was experiencing radical growth and transformation in the 1850s. This period witnessed the rise of specialized fine art dealers, such as Durand-Ruel, who catered to the increasing marketability of small-scale landscape paintings to collectors as well as a growing bourgeois public. Paintings made for the market, such as *Sunset near Arbonne* and *Hoarfrost* (figs. 4–5), reveal the careful balance Rousseau sought between an *ébauche*—with its relatively free brushwork and the reddish sauce of the ground showing through—and a more finished painting through the scattering of details and the occasional addition of figures.[46] By mid-century, artists like Rousseau, Diaz, and newcomer Gustave Courbet were speculatively and quite successfully selling their sketches, studies, and *ébauches* in art galleries as well as private auctions alongside more finished works.[47]

The rise of the naturalist school of independent landscape painters redefined artistic originality not as the intellectual capacity to transcend nature, but rather as the faithful rendition of the artist's unique impression observed directly from the motif. In the end, official support and popular preference for the optical effects of the landscape *étude* resolved the sketch-finish conflict, tipping the Academic balance that separated the

Fig. 4 Théodore Rousseau, *Hoarfrost*, 1845, oil on canvas, 25 x 38 9/16 inches (63.5 x 98 cm), The Walters Art Museum, Acquired by William T. Walters, 1882.

Fig. 5 Théodore Rousseau, *Sunset near Arbonne*, ca.1860–1865, oil on wood panel, 25 ¼ x 39 inches (64.1 x 99.1 cm), The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900.

generative from the executive stage of painting in favor of the former. The aesthetics of the sketch, first theorized in the eighteenth century and brought into sharp focus in the nineteenth, would come to embody a fusion of both phases of production. From the 1860s forward, artists began skipping the preparatory step of making an *esquisse* by painting their first impressions directly on the support, the aim being to preserve the immediacy of the sketch in the final work. The development and eventual acceptance of the sketch aesthetic during the first half of the nineteenth century paved the way to Impressionism and, eventually, to modern art as we know it today.

Notes

1 The terms as defined here were drawn from Albert Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986, pp. 34–46, and Philippe Grunchec, *Les concours d'Esquisses peintes, 1816–1863*, 2 vols., Paris: École nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts, 1986, pp. 19–20. These two publications are essential to any research on this topic and provided much of the technical and historical information addressed in this paper.

2 Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 19.

3 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 10.

4 Cited in Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 10.

5 Cited in Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 10.

6 John Minor Wisdom *et al*. *French Nineteenth Century Oil Sketches: David to Degas*, Chapel Hill, NC: William Hayes Ackland Memorial Art Center, 1978, pp. 6–7.

7 Wisdom *et al., op. cit.* (note 6), p. 6, notes that David was one of the first teachers to value the

painted sketch as an important element of official teaching.

8 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 83–87.

9 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 81.

10 Alan Wintermute (ed.), exh. cat. *Claude to Corot: The Development of Landscape Painting in France*, New York: Colnaghi, 1990, p. 237.

11 The first Prix de Rome for landscape painting was held in 1817 and Achille-Etna Michallon won first place.

12 Wintermute, *op. cit.* (note 10), p. 237.

13 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 44. The winner of this first *concours d'esquisse* was Pierre-Raymond-Jacques Monvoisin.

14 École des Beaux-Arts archives, cited in Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 22.

15 Philippe Grunchec, *The Grand Prix de Rome: Paintings from the École des Beaux-Arts, 1797–1863*, Washington, D.C.: International Exhibitions Foundation, 1984, p. 27.

16 Cited in Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 26, 28.

17 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 115.

18 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 12–14.

19 Cited in Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 79.

20 Wisdom *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 7.

21 The artist Arsenne noted, "We painters can see an excellent reason for the popularity of *ébauches*, rough sketches and spontaneous efforts of all kinds. We no longer regard this taste as an aberration. We do not look in a sketch for what is not there, but if it is by a man of genius, we see there in the embryo what is in his mind." Cited in Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 79.

22 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 87.

23 Wisdom *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 7; Grunchec, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 19.

24 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 9.

25 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 12; Kermit S. Champa *et al.*, exh. cat. *The Rise of Landscape Painting in France: Corot to Monet*, Manchester, N.H.: The Currier Gallery of Art, 1991, p. 67.

26 Although he participated in all three competitions, Delacroix decried the crippling effects of public opinion on the creative stages of production in his famous "*Lettre sur les concours*" published in *L'Artiste* in 1831: "Too much contempt awaits this chaste child born of his enthusiasm [...]. He modifies it, he spoils it, he overworks it; all this civilizing and polishing in order not to displease." Cited in Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 117.

27 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 80, 117–119.

28 Wisdom *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 7.

29 Robert Baschet, *E.-J. Delécluze, Témoin de son temps, 1781–1863*, Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1942, pp. 282–286.

30 Baschet, *op. cit.* (note 29), p. 284.

31 Wisdom *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 8. This is not to say that Delacroix considered his paintings sketches or unfinished works. Delacroix adhered to the traditional view that "one does not spoil a picture in finishing it! […] When the artist renounces the vagueness of the sketch, he shows off more of his personality, thus unveiling the entire range—but also the limits—of his talent." Cited in Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 91.

32 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 136; Wintermute, *op. cit.* (note 10), pp. 233–236.

33 Valenciennes, *Elémens de la perspective pratique*, reprinted in Joshua C. Taylor, *Nineteenth-Century Theories of Art*, Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1987, p. 253.

34 Valenciennes, *op. cit.* (note 33), pp. 253–254.

35 Boime, *op. cit.*, (note 1), pp. 137–141.

36 Wintermute, *op. cit.* (note 10), p. 242.

37 Boime, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp. 133, 152, 172–173.

38 Champa *et al*., *op. cit.* (note 25), pp. 38, 65; Wisdom *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 3, 8.

39 E.-J. Delécluze, *Exposition des Artistes Vivants, 1850*, Paris: Comon, 1851, p. 134.

40 Champa *et al*., *op. cit.* (note 25), p. 67.

41 Delécluze, *op. cit.* (note 39), p. 129.

42 Delécluze, *op. cit.* (note 39), pp. 104–106.

43 Champa *et al*., *op. cit.* (note 25), p. 69.

44 Nicholas Green, *Théodore Rousseau, 1812–1867*, London: Hazlitt, Gooden, and Fox, 1982, pp. 14–15.

45 Champa *et al*., *op. cit.* (note 25), p. 70.

46 Green, *op. cit.* (note 44), p. 61.

47 Nicholas Green, "Circuits of Production, Circuits of Consumption: The Case of Mid-Nineteenth-Century French Art Dealing," *Art Journal*, 48, Spring 1989, pp. 29–34.

Photo Credits and Sources

Fig. 1 (photo: Tiffany Matson), fig. 2 (photo: Dallas Museum of Art), fig. 3 (digital image courtesy of the National Gallery's Creative Commons License), fig. 4 (digital image courtesy of the Walter's Creative Commons License), fig. 5 (Digital image courtesy of www.metmuseum.org).